

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **11 January 2008** the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 10, 13, 21, 22, 25, and 33. Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 25, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Abramson et al. (USPN 6,539,494, hereinafter “Abramson”), and Sandhu et al. (USPN 6,985,953 hereinafter “Sandhu”), in further view of RFC 1321.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson in view of Sandhu and RFC 1321.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are not obvious over Abramson in view of Sandhu and RFC 1321, because none of these references discloses allowing two servers to share one SSL session.

Specifically, embodiments of the present invention provide a mechanism by which a first server publishes on a database a set of SSL session state information, which can be used by a second server to continue the same SSL session. This SSL session state information includes an SSL session identifier, a read key for encrypting communications from the client, a write key for encrypting communications from the server, an encrypted running message digest, and a message digest key to encrypt the running message digest.

Furthermore, after the SSL session is established with the first server, a second server can query the database and retrieve this SSL session state information. The second server can then establish an SSL session with the same SSL session identifier. See FIG. 2, FIG. 5, and the corresponding description on pages 10, 12, and 13 of the instant application.

None of Abramson, Sandhu, and RFC 1321 discloses the SSL session sharing mechanism described above. Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that SSL session sharing mechanism in the present invention includes the aforementioned features. These amendments find support in FIGs. 2 and 5, and the corresponding description on pages 10, 12, and 13 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claim 10, which depends from claim 1, claim 22, which depends from claim 13, and claim 33, which depends from claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Reg. No. 59,242

Date: 21 March 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com